98-84397-17

Spencer, Anna Garlin

Women and regulation

New York

[1896]

98-84397-17
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

339.1
Z2
Spencer, Mrs. Anna Garlin 1851-1931
Women and regulation; the relation of Lady Henry Somerset and other English women to state regulation of vice in India: address delivered at the twenty-second annual meeting of the American purity alliance
N Y [1896?] Sq D in O 20 p
No 9 of a vol of pamphlets

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 12:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA IIA IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 4-8-98 INITIALS: PB

TRACKING # : 3261/4

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

Women and Regulation.

THE RELATION OF LADY HENRY SOMERSET AND OTHER ENGLISH WOMEN TO STATE REGULATION OF VICE IN INDIA

BY

Rev. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER.

Address delivered at the Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the American Purity Alliance.

PRICE, 10 CENTS, PER HUNDRED, $7.

NEW YORK.
AMERICAN PURITY ALLIANCE
UNITED CHARITIES BUILDING
105 E. 22D STREET

The Philanthropist.

Published quarterly for the Promotion of Social Purity, the Better Protection of the Young, the Repression of Vice and the Prevention of its Regulation by the State.

AARON M. POWELL,
MRS. ANNA RICE POWELL, } Editors

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE.

$1.00 a year. Three copies, a year, $2.50. Five copies, a year, $3.75.

MRS. MARY A. LIVERMORE writes: "I am devoutly thankful for the establishment of this needed journal, and pray that it may meet with large favor."

MISS FRANCES E. WILLARD, President of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, writes: "All hail THE PHILANTHROPIST! The time is ripe for it. People only need to *know* the awful fact about girlhood's present unprotected estate, and they will rally to the rescue."

Good Health says: "In its crusade against vice and immorality, the press and all good citizens everywhere should feel it a duty to aid such a journal in any and every way in their power."

The *Friends' Intelligencer*, Philadelphia: "These are delicate, but none the less deeply important subjects, and there should be a wide and cordial sympathy with the endeavors of THE PHILANTHROPIST."

The *Baltimore Methodist*: "It is a sprightly journal, well able to take care of itself and its cause—a cause rapidly rising to the front rank of importance in Christian conscience and effort."

The *Boston Woman's Journal* says: "The paper deserves the hearty support of all friends of social purity."

MRS. ARMENIA S. WHITE, of Concord, N. H., writing to renew her subscription to THE PHILANTHROPIST, says: "It is doing a great and good work; may its moral and Christian influence continue to increase in the future as in the past."

SARAH E. STEELE, of Lockport, N. Y., says: "I consider it a most valuable paper, and it gives me news that I can get from no other source."

ANOTHER WRITES: "I wish I could find the means to place it in the hands of many mothers, ministers, physicians and teachers."

THE PHILANTHROPIST will admit approved advertisements at the following rates:

One inch, one insertion	$ 1 00
One third column, one year	18 00
One half column, one year	30 00
One column, one year	50 00

Special rates for quarter, half and full page advertisements.
Address all communications editorial and business to

The Philanthropist,

UNITED CHARITIES BUILDING, (Room 219,)
Fourth Avenue and Twenty-Second Street, New York.

Women and Regulation.

[illegible]

Rev. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

The Philanthropist.

Published quarterly for the Promotion of Social Purity, the Better Protection of the Young, the Repression of Vice, and the Prevention of its Regulation by the State.

AARON M. POWELL,
MRS. ANNA RICE POWELL, } Editors.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE.
$1.00 a year. Three copies, a year, $2.50. Five copies, a year, $3.75.

MRS. MARY A. LIVERMORE writes: "I am devoutly thankful for the establishment of this needed journal, and pray that it may meet with large favor."

MISS FRANCES E. WILLARD, President of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, writes: "All hail THE PHILANTHROPIST! The time is ripe for it. People only need to *know* the awful fact about girlhood's present unprotected estate, and they will rally to the rescue."

Good Health says: "In its crusade against vice and immorality, the press and all good citizens everywhere should feel it a duty to aid such a journal in any and every way in their power."

The *Friends' Intelligencer*, Philadelphia: "These are delicate, but none the less deeply important subjects, and there should be a wide and cordial sympathy with the endeavors of THE PHILANTHROPIST."

The *Baltimore Methodist:* "It is a sprightly journal, well able to take care of itself and its cause—a cause rapidly rising to the front rank of importance in Christian conscience and effort."

The *Boston Woman's Journal* says: "The paper deserves the hearty support of all friends of social purity."

MRS. ARMENIA S. WHITE, of Concord, N. H., writing to renew her subscription to THE PHILANTHROPIST, says: "It is doing a great and good work; may its moral and Christian influence continue to increase in the future as in the past."

SARAH E. STEELE, of Lockport, N. Y., says: "I consider it a most valuable paper, and it gives me news that I can get from no other source."

ANOTHER WRITES: "I wish I could find the means to place it in the hands of many mothers, ministers, physicians and teachers."

THE PHILANTHROPIST will admit approved advertisements at the following rates:

One inch, one insertion	$ 1 00
One third column, one year	18 00
One half column, one year	30 00
One column, one year	50 00

Special rates for quarter, half and full page advertisements.
Address all communications editorial and business to

The Philanthropist,
UNITED CHARITIES BUILDING, (Room 219,)
Fourth Avenue and Twenty-Second Street, New York.

Women and Regulation.

THE RELATION OF LADY HENRY SOMERSET AND OTHER ENGLISH WOMEN TO STATE REGULATION OF VICE IN INDIA.

BY

Rev. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER.

Address delivered at the Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the American Purity Alliance.

NEW YORK:
AMERICAN PURITY ALLIANCE,
UNITED CHARITIES BUILDING,
105 E. 22D STREET.

REV. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER.
VICE-PRESIDENT AMERICAN PURITY ALLIANCE.

WOMEN AND REGULATION.

*THE RELATION OF LADY HENRY SOMERSET AND OTHER ENGLISH WOMEN TO STATE REGULATION OF VICE IN INDIA.**

By REV. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER, PROVIDENCE, R. I., VICE-PRESIDENT AMERICAN PURITY ALLIANCE.

The Women's Christian Temperance Union of the United States, of many other countries and of the World, is the most wonderful reform organization ever known as respects numbers of membership, breadth of plan in its work, specialized education and economy of force in its leadership, missionary spreading of its propaganda and its development of the average adult and untrained womanhood in the direction of social service. It is natural therefore, that any question of method or difference in moral emphasis arising between the most prominent leaders of that organization should give occasion for widespread comment. The last Annual Meetings of the U. S. and the World's W. C. T. U. were marked with a deep undercurrent of anxiety in regard to such a difference between Lady Henry Somerset, the President of the British Women's Temperance Association and Vice President of the World's W. C. T. U. on one side, and Miss Frances Willard and her following in America and in many other countries, on the other side.

* Address at the Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the American Purity Alliance, New York.

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

This difference is not confined in its influence, however, to the W. C. T. U.; it is a sign of a great rift in the leading womanhood of our generation in respect to a great moral question. Therefore it is the business of all moral reformers, and not alone or even chiefly of the W. C. T. U., to analyze and discuss this question which is now making that organization so uneasy, viz: the position of Lady Henry Somerset on the legal treatment of social vice in India.

The friendship of Lady Somerset and Frances Willard is one of great tenderness and intensity, as is well known, and the English woman has been for years a flaming fire of devotion to the cause to which the American woman has given her life. The "British Women's Temperance Association" (now corresponding to the U. S. W. C. T. U.) had originally for its object the simple and sole endeavor to spread the principles and practice of total abstinence from intoxicants; and was at first loath to give up this simplicity of plan for the "Do Everything Policy" of the W. C. T. U. But after the election of Lady Henry as President, in 1891, and after two years of her influence in that office, the B. W. T. A. was made auxiliary to the World's W. C. T. U. and was classified and broadened in its work after the American pattern. Since which time it has increased from a few thousand members to 100,000 with 600 auxiliaries. This later introduction into the English society of the multiple pledges and obligations, as well as the earlier introduction of the same principle in the American Society, gave the women's temperance movement of the

two leading Anglo Saxon nations, and of the world, through them, the disadvantage of their advantage as compared with previous temperance movements. It is an advantage in many ways, especially in the winning of great hosts of followers, to have so many departments of work as the W. C. T. U. has now adopted. But it is a disadvantage in that it makes it morally obligatory upon all the *general officers* of the body everywhere to hold allegiance to all the forms of work legally adopted as essential, and hence makes more complicated the ethical demand upon such officers. On general principles, a reform organization is more effective when specialized to its one demand for ethical change, (as for instance, to free the slaves, to secure social purity, to spread total abstinence and make warfare upon the saloon), for a reform organization needs to secure as allies all persons who are agreed on its one point whether or not they are agreed upon any other ethical detail. But the W. C. T. U. has been not only a reform organization, but also a great school for the broadening and utilizing for social service of the orthodox church womanhood of America; and an educational institution should be as broad and flexible as it is usually best that a reform organization should be sharply specialized. The mixing of the educational and reformatory methods in the work of the W. C. T. U. has made several questions other than those which pertain to the drink-mania and the saloon evil, a recognized part of its work. Very early the work for social purity became such a recognized part of its devotion and with more logical

and inevitable reason than that of any other related department; for social impurity and intemperance are twin vices, never found far apart in the dens of degraded humanity, and interrelated in every fibre of hereditary taint, personal weakness, civic danger and penal administration throughout Christian civilization.

Of course there is but one woman in the world who should be World's Superintendent of the department of Social Purity in the W. C. T. U., or in any other World organization having a woman leader in that form of moral effort, and that woman is Josephine Butler, the special saint and martyr of this cause; the woman who roused all England and the world to the horror and danger of law-protected social immorality; and succeeded with her allies, men and women) in securing the repeal of the infamous Contagious Diseases Acts for the garrison towns of Great Britain, and has so long worked at the head of the social purity forces of all Christendom to establish one equal law of purity for both sexes and to make forever and everywhere impossible the slavery of women and the added degradation of men which always result from the licensing of the social evil. And Josephine Butler was asked to take that office, and did so.

It is not necessary in this audience to detail the work of the social purity leaders under Mrs. Butler's guidance, both within and without the ranks of the W. C. T. U. Suffice it to say that after most encouraging advance has been made all along the line of protection for girlhood and elevation of sentiment and law in this regard, both in England and in her dependencies, a party of reaction-

ists, headed, we are told, by Lord Salisbury, has recently declared determination to reintroduce in the garrison towns of India the old and worst forms of legal provision for the prostitution of English soldiers.

To this movement women have given their support. A long list of titled women, closely allied with the families and influences prominent at the Foreign Office and in the ranks of military leadership, and not only of these but of women noted in the medical, literary and social world, have signed petitions asking that, for the sake of the health of the British soldiery and the British homes connected with them, the old system of Government provision and Government supervision of the sexual indulgence of the Army in India be reinstated. To this movement Lady Henry Somerset opposes, not the uncompromising and influential rebuke and appeal universally expected of her, but a substitute scheme of her own; a scheme intended, as she claims, "as a quarantine and not a license measure," and intended also, of course, to moderate and control the social evil, yet a scheme which, like every other plan of Government license, specifically allows vice and legally provides for it within certain specified limits. She defends her position as "not immoral" or tending to immorality, because her plan calls for the medical examination of only those Indian women who have expressed a determination to lead an unchaste life and by women physicians only; and also because her plan calls for a registration and medical inspection of all the men frequenting the houses of such women and the loss to those men of the mark

"exemplary" which entitles them to promotion in the British Army. She characterizes this as introducing "equality between the men and the woman." Her whole position on this point is absolutely childish in its inadequacy. In the first place all serious students of the relation between the military influence and the legalizing of the social evil know well that such regulations as she suggests for British soldiers would not be required by any governmental authority, and could not be enforced, with any efficiency, if they were. And in the second place, such regulations, if made and enforced, would not secure any "equality" between the timid Indian woman and the British soldier, who is to her the symbol of her country's subjection. She is already enslaved by an inherited family tyranny, often at tender age placed away from her own parents in the family of her intended husband, and likely by his death or other circumstance to become an unwelcome and ill-treated burden upon the slender resources of the household, and likely in that case to be sold for purposes of shame or else made so reckless as to easily seek a vicious life,—without training for any industrial pursuit outside of the zenana what independent choice has such an Indian woman? And since Lady Somerset's own scheme provides for the specified and restricted residence of every woman registered and medically inspected as unchaste, and allows the soldier who visits her to come and go freely except for the registry of his name and the inspection of the doctor, what "equality" could there be in such a condition where one party is held to a single

place and a constant supervision and the other made free to pass at will from the purest to the foulest companionship?

Lady Henry Somerset's scheme, like that of every other of similar import, holds within itself the primal injustice and inequality of treatment which makes of two partners in a common vice the one a member of an ostracised class, shut up to unrelieved companionship of evil and separated from all wholesome and regenerative influences of ordinary domestic and social life, while it makes of the other partner (no matter how severe the implied condemnation for his act) merely a sinning individual, with all the higher influences of life at his command directly he forsakes his wicked way and even while he persists in it. That the noblest and wisest womanhood could fail to see this is a shock to the conscience as well as the intellect of all social reformers who have gone to the bottom of this question; and such will not only "dare" but feel it their duty to stigmatize Lady Henry Somerset's proposition as "immoral": quite as immoral as is the attitude of the titled and otherwise leading women of England who have in more general and sweeping manner given in their adherence to the legalizing of vice.

Up to this time women have been a moral solidarity in their public action and speech regarding the social evil. Not that women are a moral unit upon this or any other ethical question, but that the portion of womanhood free enough and brave enough to take any public cognizance of the matter have spoken

as one voice in favor of a single standard of purity for both sexes and no legal provision for lust. The great mass of womanhood, however, is not yet either free or brave. The worst effect of the age-long subjection of women to men in the family, the school, the church and the State, has been this:—that they have developed the moral servility which always distinguishes a subject class and have condoned men's vices as pay for their own protection and support. History records, therefore, the silent if not the willing consent of women to whatsoever legal regulations respecting the social evil men might think fit to make, and all social life witnesses the daily sacrifice at the marriage altar of pure maidens to vile men with the aid and approval of their mothers, while the double standard of morals thus sanctioned by the church finds in the fashionable and selfish and unthinking womanhood its strongest and most subtle support. But the women of education and individual initiative, the women who have begun to feel strongly that social consciousness which is now teaching us all that we live not for self alone, and not for our dearest alone, but for the great whole of our common humanity, these women have been one in all outward expression up to this time, when they have touched upon that most interior and fatal of social diseases, the vice which degrades marriage and spoils the home. To-day, however, we witness a conflict of ethical standards in the very heart of social conservatism and domestic purity, in the leading womanhood of the leading Anglo Saxon civilization. I confess that to me this is the saddest and the most fateful sign

of the past year's experience. Not the awful suffering of Armenia or the pusillanimous perfidy of Christian nations in dealing with it; not the woeful condition of Cuba or the famine-stricken suffering of India; not even that triumph of bad elements in our American Empire City in the recent election,—although all have been to me as personal afflictions,—not any or all of them together have saddened and disheartened me so much as this fact. That in England, the storm centre of social purity reform, in England, the home of Josephine Butler and the battleground on which was waged and won so great a fight against the legalization of vice, women of intellectual and moral as well as of social leadership should have signed petitions to again place the gentle and oppressed women of India in legal bondage to the lust of British soldiers is saddening indeed. To find Dr. Garrett Anderson among these women was bad enough, but she is a Doctor, and the physician class interest is still strong in favor of such legal provision and supervision of vice (although few great women Doctors hold that position and many leading medical men, both here and abroad, take strong issue against it). The Physician class, however, have led in the advocacy of such measures, and women naturally accept the ethical standards of the professions into which they enter so late. To find Mrs. Humphrey Ward among these petitioners was disappointing, but she might be ignorant of the history and facts of the subject, however wise upon other points, and might have accepted guidance from others in whom she had confidence without sufficient personal considera-

tion. But to find Lady Henry Somerset among the list was a surprise and puzzle past understanding! As President of the B. W. T. A. and Vice President of the World's W. C. T. U. she could not sign such a petition as an individual merely; she was high custodian of the interests of the White Ribbon Army which had sent its missionaries around the world, declaring to the corrupt society of Continental cities and in the very strongholds of Oriental degradation of women, its gospel of "A White Life for Two" and no fellowship with the unclean thing. She had stood by Dr. Bushnell and Mrs. Andrew bravely and helpfully in their Parliamentary experience, which had aided so greatly in securing better conditions for India in this very particular, and she had valiantly opposed the return to Parliament of a profligate man; she had worked in season and out of season for the cleansing of public places of amusement and for the rescue and help of fallen girls and women. Above all, she had easy access to all the array of facts collected by that eminent jurist and noble lover of justice, Dr. Sheldon Amos, and to the Blue Books of the "Parliamentary Commission of Enquiry, concerning the Contagious Acts," those records which had furnished Josephine Butler and her allies with the weapons of warfare in the great struggle which cleansed the garrison towns of Great Britain from the accursed thing. How could she mistake her way with such guidance at hand? Had she not read (as moral reformer she cannot be excused for ignorance if she had not) the terrible revelations of that Parliamentary Commission of Enquiry, when the use-

lessness of such legal provisions from a sanitary point of view was proved by the testimony concerning the constant complaint of all authorities in all "regulated" cities, that no law served to check "unregulated vice"? Had she not seen from the final assertion of high medical testimony before that Commission what was the real basis of the plea for such "regulation," viz., that men's appetites could not be controlled and that therefore some women, a minority, should be absolutely sacrificed for the benefit of those men and that of the majority of women? And if she saw clearly that basis of infidelity alike to man's dignity of character and the right of all women to social protection, how could she subscribe to the blasphemy even afar off?

The hosts of the W. C. T. U. have not followed Lady Henry Somerset and the titled and leading women associated with her in this apostacy. There was not a single vote in favor of her compromise scheme in the B. W. T. A., and the World's and our National W. C. T. U. passed the strongest possible resolutions in favor of the complete gospel of purity, personal and social, to which they had been before committed. Lady Henry Somerset herself, however, was not rebuked except by implication, and was re-elected President of the B W. T. A. with only 17 dissenting votes out of 500, and was elected again Vice President of the World's W. C. T. U. by its Executive Committee. The tender way in which she was treated attests the great love the women bear her and forever disposes of the old slander that women

are so personal in their judgments that they cannot separate the opinion they oppose from the person who holds that opinion. I admire the sweetness and breadth of the women so acting, and admire Frances Willard for the frank manner in which she faced the issue concerning her dear friend. I think, however, that Lady Henry Somerset has no right, morally, to hold high office in the W. C. T. U. or any organization especially pledged to social purity principles, while she repudiates one of the fundamental ethical doctrines upon which social purity work is based. I do not mean, of course, that she has no moral right to adopt the view she has espoused or to work for her scheme if, as she honestly believes, it would be the compromise measure of practical statesmanship on this terrible question. I, for one, would honor her from my heart if in this vital matter and at this most critical time her reason and her conscience called her to separate from her comrades of the W. C. T. U., and she took her way out from their ranks, solitary and alone. Not all the world's martyrs have been on the right side; many have mistaken the red flush of some new morning of human growth for the glare of a consuming conflagration of all that was beautiful and precious in past and present life, and, so mistaking, have perished in useless battle with "whatsoever forces draw the ages on." For such martyrs, "by the pang without the crown," who would not drop a tear of pitying love? And if Lady Henry and the other women who until now have stood for the most advanced position on this question of ethics must be of that company, one would give them

honor if they followed even a mistaken ideal bravely and in lonely suffering. But to join the enemies of one's own army, or even to stand neutral in the midst of a fateful battle, and yet wear that army's uniform and retain its generalship,—this is an incomprehensible position! And in that position Lady Henry Somerset stands today. Her resignation of the Presidency of the B. W. T. A. for "ill health" relieves the position practically but does not morally.

I said that Frances Willard faced the issue frankly and nobly, and she did so, with equal insistance that her friend beloved should not be personally condemned and yet that the position of the W. C. T. U. on this vital question should be in no wise misunderstood or compromised. I have, however, looked in vain through the report of Miss Willard's two addresses at Toronto and at Buffalo, and of the resolutions and remarks of the two great meetings as well, for the one thing that should have been said when this question was discussed. That one thing of paramount importance, which should have been and was not said, I have already outlined; but I must deal with the point more particularly, for it is the pith and marrow of the whole ethical position of the radical thinker upon this subject. The one thing of paramount importance to insist upon is this: that there is something more socially dangerous than even governmental complicity with vice inhering in all "regulative" schemes, even that of Lady Somerset, *and that is an invasion of the law of personal liberty and of equality of human rights*, the two principles which are at the very

heart of our Anglo Saxon civilization. Miss Willard, like most temperance reformers, draws her strongest illustration against licensing the social evil from what evidently seems to her the exactly parallel wrong of licensing the saloon. In point of fact, however, the licensing of the social evil by any method ever proposed or pursued differs radically from the licensing of the saloon, and by so much as it differs is it the more immoral and dangerous. The difference lies in this: the licensing of the saloon, although binding the State influence to a dangerous business, does not place any permanent restrictions or stigma upon any class associated with the saloon, while the licensing of the social evil singles out a class of citizens, deprives them of ordinary rights, brands them, puts them in specified residences, invades their personal liberty in ways no other class of citizens have ever suffered in modern times, and, in short, makes of them truly and literally an "abandoned" class, counted out of every normal and natural saving and protecting influence of society. It leaves such women with only one right the virtuous or the vile are bound to respect, the right to be "rescued," itself a continuance (although a more merciful one) of the class exclusion which legal enactment fastens upon them. This is the real iniquity of the "laws regulating the social evil,"—this rather than any superficial resemblance to the licensing of liquor saloons. To make a real and not a fictitious parallel between the licensed saloon and the licensed disreputable house we should have to "register" the men who bought liquor; take them away from their

families and shut them in houses by themselves, which should be at all times open to the inspection of the police in all the most secret chambers; subject them to physical indignities, and allow as their principal, almost their only companions, the liquor sellers with their wares; and deny to them the power to protect themselves against the most foul and dangerous personal attacks on the ground that having been proved not virtuous they therefore might be the prey of all the worst elements of society in the community in which they lived!

The licensing of the saloon I consider socially dangerous and therefore oppose; I believe it to be proved socially dangerous by the fact that the saloon is so fully recognized as a public nuisance that no respectable person wants one next his door for his own children to become familiar with and therefore no respectable person should be willing to have one next his poorer neighbor's door for that neighbors children to become familiar with; proved socially dangerous by the fact that the saloon is mixed up with all our worst political corruption, with the failure of justice in our lower courts, with the debauchery of our police and all the manifold administrative iniquities of our city governments and therefore should not have so much power over political appointees of any sort as inheres in the lower or the "higher" license fee. But the licensing of prostitution is not only socially dangerous for these same reasons, but also for the still deeper and more achaic iniquity hidden within it, viz: that such licensing of prostitution creates of one set of offenders a legally

degraded class, ostracised from common human privileges and left without redress in courts of justice for personal outrages, while of a similar set of offenders (equally guilty, often more guilty and far more numerous) it makes a class legally protected in all common rights and eligible to all social uplift. It is because of this monstrous injustice which is in the very constitution and nature of all permissive and "regulative" legislation upon the social evil, that some of us will fight it as a last refuge of human slavery, now and forever more become "the sum of all villainy." It is because of this injustice that Josephine Butler rightly called such legislation a "Violation of the Constitution" and Sheldon Amos declared it to be "an outrage upon the personal rights of women and contrary to the spirit of British law and institutions."

The real nature of this legislation was confessed by its advocates at the hearings before that Parliamentary Commission of Enquiry of which I have spoken. There was no disguise attempted respecting the doctrine that "a fallen woman had no rights which society was bound to respect." When one of the members of Parliament asked the leading medical advocate for licensing prostitution in the garrison towns of Great Britain, if he felt no scruple at the degradation inevitably inflicted by such a law upon the women affected by it, he answered, "No scruple at all, sir. I look upon a fallen woman as I do upon a public sewer, as something which should be cleansed for the public safety." These be hard and difficult words to repeat even before a special audience

of Purity workers like this, but they are truthful indications of the real spirit and meaning of this monstrous idea which some of the women of England who are good and wise, are accepting as a "necessary compromise." God forbid that women who see and know that this is not alone, or chiefly, the question of how far it is statesmanlike to license dangerous and vicious businesses, but that deeper question of the right of society to sacrifice a portion of the community to the pleasure or supposed wellbeing of another portion, should fear to speak out with the plainness demanded by the hour.

We cannot do away with social evils by any short cuts, still less by any lying subterfuges, which cheat neither nature nor God. We must bear the foul spots upon our civilization until we are grown strong enough and wise enough to prevent or cure them. We must endure the presence among us of bad women and bad men, vicious, weak, degraded, diseased, the morally incompetent of the race, until all learn to be pure and strong and noble and well. While there is a neglected, untrained, badly born or badly bred child among us, there will be social demoralization of all sorts springing from that one perverted or undeveloped life. We must work against these evil things with all our might while we live, but they will remain to torment and handicap our children's children; for human growth is a slow process and God is awfully patient with sin.

We cannot make wholesome and decent the physical conditions surrounding individual lives, without long and patient effort; how then can mankind wipe out these deep seated personal and social diseases, intemperance and impurity, save by ages of heroic labor ?

But this one thing we can do now:—The freer, and braver and wiser womanhood, and the purer, nobler and juster manhood united together can do it to-day in many of the centres of civilization:—We can declare to mag-

istrates and law-givers the world around: "This, Sirs, ye shall not do, Ye shall not rend the sacred, seamless robe of womanhood in twain and dedicate in the name and by the power of law one part to honor and one to dishonor! Ye shall not, in the market place of commercial conquest or international bargainings, cast lots for the vesture of innocence, or trample underfoot the common rights of humanity in the person of the most abject or degraded woman of the most backward or oppressed race."

It is for such an hour and for such a work as this that womanhood has come into its kingdom of freedom and opportunity and power. If some women fail to read the meaning of this new time, and the meaning of the ages of mother-training their sex has received, the worse for them and those they influence; but the more all truly enlightened women must do and dare to make clear the Divine Purpose in their lives. The ages of woman's subjection to child-needs and to family demands were the schooling of womanhood in *reverence for individual life*, which when she becomes free and trained, must grow to encompass the world of undeveloped life, and forbid her to consent to the outrage of the least and worst of these our brothers or our sisters, on any plea or for any purpose.

It is not for nought that the silent and reserve forces of the home are now entering the world of thought and affairs as never before. Although a few women among even the great and good and wise miss direction, the great host of the mother-sex will enter that world stronger than an army with banners to succor every neglected child, to protect every exposed youth, and to forbid in the name of justice and of love that any class of men or of women shall be "abandoned" to evil or serve as scape-goats for the common sin of weak and struggling humanity.

LADY HENRY SOMERSET RETRACTS.

[Just as the accompanying pamphlet edition of the address by Rev. Anna Garlin Spencer, at the Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the American Purity Alliance, had left the printer's hands and was ready for distribution, we were advised from London of the following letter from Lady Henry Somerset to Lord George Hamilton, for an early copy of which we are indebted to Frances E. Willard. Though not all we could wish, we rejoice at this disavowal on the part of Lady Henry of her very objectionable propositions of April last, and are glad to be able to enclose her letter as supplementary to this address.

Mrs. Spencer's powerful arraignment of the Regulation system still applies, essentially, to the other titled and distinguished English women Memorialists in behalf of Regulation in India.—A. M. P.]

LADY HENRY SOMERSET TO LORD GEORGE HAMILTON.

EASTNOR CASTLE, LEDBURY, ENGLAND, Jan. 28, 1896.

DEAR LORD GEORGE HAMILTON:

Your Lordship invited me ten months ago to give you my view of the dispatch that has been addressed to the Government of India on the health of the Army, and in a letter in which I did so I ventured to suggest some methods moral and disciplinary, which seemed to me the only ones likely to succeed because they had at least the merit of being logical.

I was led to do so by two considerations: First, the dispatch in question seemed to imply that the Government would give encouragement to any form of elevating agency, and so emphasize the altered spirit in which the subject was approached, and that such suggested supervision would only affect an incorrigible minimum; and second, that the system I had in mind would be so drastic and penal in its nature as to make State interference odious and finally impossible. That was ten months ago, and in that time nothing

has been done, of which the public has heard, to strengthen the forces that make for moral improvement.

What has been done, viz., the repeal of the Indian Acts of 1895, which prohibited inspection, has been in a direction exactly opposite. It seems to have been the object of the Government to obtain the maximum of impunity with the minimum of protest from those who desire to see the State shape its actions according to Christian views of ethics.

I need not tell your Lordship I am not writing to say how strongly I am still opposed to the course which the Government has taken. But I find that my letter to your Lordship of last year has been taken by many to mean that I am on the side of the accepted view of State regulation, and I am from time to time quoted as a sympathizer with such views. I am therefore writing to withdraw any proposals made in that letter for the reason that the events of the past year have convinced me of the inadvisibility and extreme danger of the system that in April last I thought might be instituted. The absence of any serious effort by the Government to bring about a higher standard in the Army is a final proof to me that as long as regulation of any kind can be resorted to as a remedy, it will always be regarded as the one and only panacea. My view was that it would be instituted as an odious but possibly effective auxiliary to moral efforts; I find it will always be accepted as a convenient substitute.

I take the liberty of addressing this explicit withdrawal of an endorsement of whatever form of the principle of regulation, because it was in a letter to your Lordship that I originally incurred the responsibility. I trust therefore to your Lordship's indulgence to forgive me troubling you further with the matter.

I remain, my Lord,

Yours very truly,

ISABEL SOMERSET.

THE LORD GEORGE HAMILTON.

THE PHILANTHROPIST SERIES.

The following leaflets of the PHILANTHROPIST SERIES have been published:

1.—"LEGAL PROTECTION FOR YOUNG GIRLS," by Aaron M. Powell.
2.—"THE STATE AND GIRLHOOD," by Emily Blackwell, M. D.
3.—"SAVE THE BOYS," by Rev. J. P. Gledstone.
4.—"SOCIAL PURITY THE LATEST AND GREATEST CRUSADE," eight pages, by Frances E. Willard.
5.—"THE SACREDNESS OF MOTHERHOOD," by Mrs. Elizabeth P. Bond.
6.—"THE WHITE CROSS," by the Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter D. D., Bishop of New York.
7.—"MRS. BUTLER—THE NEW MORAL CRUSADE," with portrait, eight pages, reprinted from *The Christian*, London.
8.—"THE DOUBLE STANDARD OF MORALITY," by Mrs. J. E. Butler.
9.—"CLEAN LIPS," by Rev. J. P. Gledstone.
10.—"HOW TO ORGANIZE THE WHITE CROSS—ITS OBJECTS AND METHODS," eight pages, by Rev. B. F. De Costa, D. D.
11.—"THE SACREDNESS OF FATHERHOOD," by Rev. A. H. Lewis, D.D.
12.—"GUARDING THE YOUNG," by Mrs. Elizabeth Powell Bond.
13.—"AGE OF CONSENT" LEGISLATION, by Rev. A. H. Lewis, D. D.
14.—"NEED OF COMBINATION AMONG WOMEN FOR SELF-PROTECTION, eight pages, by Emily Blackwell, M. D.
15.—"THE SIN OF IMPURITY," 8pp., by Rev. Canon Wilberforce, A.M.
16.—"DRINK AND VICE," by Aaron M. Powell.
17.—"WAGES AND VICE," by Rev. A. H. Lewis, D. D.
18.—"HIGH IDEALS OF PURITY," eight pages, by Anna Rice Powell.
19.—"LAW AND IMMORALITY," by Rev. A. H. LEWIS, D. D.
20.—"SOCIAL VICE AND NATIONAL DECAY," 8pp. by Rev. W. T. Sabine.
21.—"GIRLHOOD AND PURITY"—A PORTION OF A PRIVATE LETTER TO GIRLS, eight pages, by GRACE H. DODGE.
22.—"REGULATION FALLACIES"—Vice not a "Necessity,"—eight pages, by Emily Blackwell, M. D.
23.—"THE NEED FOR WORK TO PROMOTE SOCIAL PURITY,"—eight pages, by Elizabeth Powell Bond.
24.—"AN EARNEST APPEAL TO YOUNG WOMEN," by a Friend.
25.—"THE WHITE CROSS IN EDUCATION," 8pp., by F. E. Willard.
26.—"A MOTHER'S LETTER TO HER SON," by Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt.
27.—"MESSAGE TO YOUNG MEN—WILD OATS," eight pages, by Rev. J. P. Gledstone.
28.—"SOCIAL PURITY—THE RIGHT TRAINING OF CHILDREN," eight pages, by Edward B. Rawson.
29.—"MEDICAL DECLARATION CONCERNING CHASTITY," eight pages, signed by many Physicians.
30.—"MINISTERIAL DECLARATION AGAINST LEGALIZED VICE," eight pages, signed by many Ministers.
31.—"CHRIST'S TEACHING ON THE SOCIAL EVIL," eight pages by Rev. Lyman Abbott, D. D.
32.—"PHYSICAL ASPECT OF THE PURITY MOVEMENT," by Douglass Caulkins, M. D.

They will be mailed, post paid, to any address, at ten cents a dozen; fifty cents a hundred. No. 4, No. 7, No. 10, No. 14, No. 15, No. 17, No. 18, No. 20, No. 21, No. 22, No. 23, No. 25, No. 27, No. 28, No. 29, No. 30, and No. 31, eight pages, twenty cents a dozen, one dollar a hundred.

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

has been done, of which the public has heard, to strengthen the forces that make for moral improvement.

What has been done, viz., the repeal of the Indian Acts of 1895, which prohibited inspection, has been in a direction exactly opposite. It seems to have been the object of the Government to obtain the maximum of impunity with the minimum of protest from those who desire to see the State shape its actions according to Christian views of ethics.

I need not tell your Lordship I am not writing to say how strongly I am still opposed to the course which the Government has taken. But I find that my letter to your Lordship of last year has been taken by many to mean that I am on the side of the accepted view of State regulation, and I am from time to time quoted as a sympathizer with such views. I am therefore writing to withdraw any proposals made in that letter for the reason that the events of the past year have convinced me of the inadvisibility and extreme danger of the system that in April last I thought might be instituted. The absence of any serious effort by the Government to bring about a higher standard in the Army is a final proof to me that as long as regulation of any kind can be resorted to as a remedy, it will always be regarded as the one and only panacea. My view was that it would be instituted as an odious but possibly effective auxiliary to moral efforts. I find it will always be accepted as a convenient substitute.

I take the liberty of addressing this explicit withdrawal of an endorsement of whatever form of the principle of regulation, because it was in a letter to your Lordship that I originally incurred the responsibility. I trust therefore to your Lordship's indulgence to forgive me troubling you further with the matter.

I remain, my Lord,

Yours very truly,

ISABEL SOMERSET.

THE LORD GEORGE HAMILTON.

SOCIAL PURITY LEAFLETS.

THE PHILANTHROPIST SERIES.

The following leaflets of the PHILANTHROPIST SERIES have been published:

1.—"LEGAL PROTECTION FOR YOUNG GIRLS," by Aaron M. Powell.
2.—"THE STATE AND GIRLHOOD," by Emily Blackwell, M. D.
3.—"SAVE THE BOYS," by Rev. J. P. Gledstone.
4.—"SOCIAL PURITY THE LATEST AND GREATEST CRUSADE," eight pages, by Frances E. Willard.
5.—"THE SACREDNESS OF MOTHERHOOD," by Mrs. Elizabeth P. Bond.
6.—"THE WHITE CROSS," by the Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter D. D., Bishop of New York.
7.—"MRS. BUTLER—THE NEW MORAL CRUSADE," with portrait, eight pages, reprinted from *The Christian*, London.
8.—"THE DOUBLE STANDARD OF MORALITY," by Mrs. J. E. Butler.
9.—"CLEAN LIPS," by Rev. J. P. Gledstone.
10.—"HOW TO ORGANIZE THE WHITE CROSS—ITS OBJECTS AND METHODS," eight pages, by Rev. B. F. De Costa, D. D.
11.—"THE SACREDNESS OF FATHERHOOD," by Rev. A. H. Lewis, D.D.
12.—"GUARDING THE YOUNG," by Mrs. Elizabeth Powell Bond.
13.—"AGE OF CONSENT" LEGISLATION, by Rev. A. H. Lewis, D. D.
14.—"NEED OF COMBINATION AMONG WOMEN FOR SELF-PROTECTION, eight pages, by Emily Blackwell, M. D.
15.—"THE SIN OF IMPURITY," 8pp., by Rev. Canon Wilberforce, A.M.
16.—"DRINK AND VICE," by Aaron M. Powell.
17.—"WAGES AND VICE," by Rev. A. H. Lewis, D. D.
18.—"HIGH IDEALS OF PURITY," eight pages, by Anna Rice Powell.
19.—"LAW AND IMMORALITY," by Rev. A. H. LEWIS, D. D.
20.—"SOCIAL VICE AND NATIONAL DECAY," 8pp. by Rev. W. T. Sabine.
21.—"GIRLHOOD AND PURITY"—A PORTION OF A PRIVATE LETTER TO GIRLS, eight pages, by GRACE H. DODGE.
22.—"REGULATION FALLACIES"—Vice not a "Necessity,"—eight pages, by Emily Blackwell, M. D.
23.—"THE NEED FOR WORK TO PROMOTE SOCIAL PURITY,"—eight pages, by Elizabeth Powell Bond.
24.—"AN EARNEST APPEAL TO YOUNG WOMEN," by a Friend.
25.—"THE WHITE CROSS IN EDUCATION," 8pp., by F. E. Willard.
26.—"A MOTHER'S LETTER TO HER SON," by Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt.
27.—"MESSAGE TO YOUNG MEN—WILD OATS," eight pages, by Rev. J. P. Gledstone.
28.—"SOCIAL PURITY—THE RIGHT TRAINING OF CHILDREN," eight pages, by Edward B. Rawson.
29.—"MEDICAL DECLARATION CONCERNING CHASTITY," eight pages, signed by many Physicians.
30.—"MINISTERIAL DECLARATION AGAINST LEGALIZED VICE," eight pages, signed by many Ministers.
31.—"CHRIST'S TEACHING ON THE SOCIAL EVIL," eight pages by Rev. Lyman Abbott, D. D.
32.—"PHYSICAL ASPECT OF THE PURITY MOVEMENT," by Douglass Caulkins, M. D.

They will be mailed, post paid, to any address, at ten cents a dozen; fifty cents a hundred. No. 4, No. 7, No. 10, No. 14, No. 15, No. 17, No. 18, No. 20, No. 21, No. 22, No. 23, No. 25, No. 27, No. 28, No. 29, No. 30, and No. 31, eight pages, twenty cents a dozen, one dollar a hundred.

THE

National Purity Congress;

Its Papers, Addresses and Portraits. .. .. ..

CONTAINING Fifty Papers and Addresses by gifted writers and speakers of our own and other countries, covering many aspects of the Purity Question—Rescue, Educational, Preventive, Legislative, Economic and Religious.

Also sixty-two finely executed half-tone portraits of distinguished men and women, widely known representatives of the Purity Movement in Europe and America.

Edited by AARON M. POWELL, of THE PHILANTHROPIST, and President of the American Purity Alliance.

The most valuable contribution yet made to Purity Literature in any country. Handsomely printed and substantially bound. Most desirable for Library use, public and private, for Parents, Teachers, Clergymen, Journalists, Legislators and others.

472 PAGES. PRICE, $2.50.

Address, with checks or money orders,

THE AMERICAN PURITY ALLIANCE,

THE UNITED CHARITIES BUILDING,

Fourth Ave. and 22d St., New York.

END OF
TITLE